



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/057,728	01/25/2002	Clifford Liem	IMP-004 (8326/7)	2788

23701 7590 05/30/2006

RAUSCHENBACH PATENT LAW GROUP, LLC
P.O. BOX 387
BEDFORD, MA 01730

EXAMINER

TO, JENNIFER N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2195

DATE MAILED: 05/30/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/057,728

Applicant(s)

LIEM ET AL.

Examiner

Jennifer N. To

Art Unit

2195

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 March 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 and 23-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14, 23-36 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-14, and 23-36 are pending for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 1-14, 23-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

- a. The following terms lacks antecedent basis:

- i. the multiprocessor – claim 12;

- b. The claim language in the following claims is not clearly understood:

- i. as per claim 1, lines 4, the use of the word “characterized” is inappropriate since 35 USC 112, second paragraph, requires the claim to particularly point out and distinctly claim the invention, not merely its characteristics. Furthermore, if this word is eliminated, then the remaining format of the claim should be modified in order to reflect this correction. Line 5, it is not clearly understood what is the relationship between “a configurable multiple processor” and the “configurable multiprocessor” of line 2 (i.e. is it the same or different, if it is the same then the term “the” should be used instead of “a” as recited in line 5).

- ii. as per claims 23, and 34, they had the same deficiencies as claim 1 above. Appropriated corrections are required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 1-9, and 23-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Dave et al. (hereafter Dave) (U.S. Patent No. 6110220).

6. Dave was cited by applicant IDS filed 10/28/2002.

7. As per claim 1, Dave teaches the invention as claim including a method of mapping a plurality of tasks and mapping a plurality of data onto a configurable multiprocessor, distributed memory hardware architecture (abstract, lines 1-10), the method comprising:

describing a task-level network of behaviors, which characterizes an embedded system, onto a configurable multiple processor and distributed memory hardware

Art Unit: 2195

architecture, each of the task-level network of behaviors being related to each other through control and data flow (col. 5, lines 4-67; col. 6, lines 1-23);

predicting a schedule of tasks for the task-level network of behaviors (col. 6, lines 25-67; col. 7, lines 1-8; col. 11, lines 48-67; col. 12, lines 1-4); and

allocating the plurality of tasks to at least one processor and allocating the plurality of data to at least one distributed memory in the configurable multiple processor, distributed memory hardware architecture, in response to the predicted schedule of tasks (abstract; col. 3, lines 46-64; col. 4, lines 5-12; col. 7, line 12 through col. 9, line 67; col. 12, lines 19-35).

8. As per claim 2, Dave teaches that wherein the predicting the schedule of tasks comprises minimizing execution time of the plurality of tasks (col. 11, lines 48-67; col. 12, lines 1-4).

9. As per claim 3, Dave teaches that wherein the predicting the schedule of tasks comprises minimizing the schedule of tasks by allocating data to at least one distributed memory in the configurable multiple processor, distributed memory hardware architecture in order to minimize data transfers (col. 5, line 35 through col. 6, line 23).

10. As per claim 4, Dave teaches that wherein the predicting the schedule of tasks comprises maximizing parallel execution of the plurality of tasks on at least two

processors in the configurable multiple processor, distributed memory hardware architecture (col. 6, line 48-col. 8, line 62).

11. As per claim 5, Dave teaches that wherein the allocating the plurality of tasks to at least on one processor in the configurable multiple processor, distributed memory hardware architecture, which has optimal processor resources for the tasks (abstract; col. 3, line 40 through col. 4, line 12).

12. As per claim 6, Dave teaches that wherein the predicting the schedule of tasks comprises using resource-based module of the configurable multiple processor, distributed memory hardware architecture to predict the schedule of tasks (col. 3, lines 40-64).

13. As per claim 7, Dave teaches that wherein the predicting the schedule of tasks comprises using an interval graph and an execution time model of the task-level network of behaviors to predict the schedule of tasks (figs. 1(a-b)-3(a-c)).

14. As per claim 8, Dave teaches that wherein the allocating the plurality of tasks and data comprises an iterative allocation process (fig. 4).

15. As per claim 9, Dave teaches that wherein the iterative allocation process comprises using a demand-driven and constraint-based objective function (fig. 4).

16. As per claim 23, Dave teaches the invention as claim including a method for executing a schedule of tasks in a configurable multiprocessor, distributed memory architecture (abstract), the method comprising:

generating the schedule of tasks based at least in part on a task-level network of behaviors, which characterizes an embedded system (col. 5, lines 4-67; col. 6, line 1 through col. 7, line 8);

calculating a demand function based at least in part on a constraint related to at least one of a plurality of tasks in the schedule of tasks (col. 7, line 12 through col. 8, line 17; col. 9, lines 45-67); and

allocating a task having highest priority to a processor having least cost according to the demand function (col. 10, lines 1-63; col. 11, line 48 through col. 12, lines 1-35).

17. As per claim 24, Dave teaches allocating a data block to a memory in the distributed memory (col. 5, lines 63-65; col. 9, lines 34-45).

18. As per claim 25, Dave teaches that the demand function is calculated based at least in part on the task-level network of behaviors (col. 9, lines 13-67).

19. As per claim 26, Dave teaches that the demand function is calculated based at least in part on an impact on the schedule of tasks (col. 9, lines 13-67).

20. As per claim 27, Dave teaches that wherein the demand function is calculated based at least in part on an impact on data movement (col. 9, lines 13-67).

21. As per claim 28, Dave teaches that wherein the demand function is calculated based at least in part on prior allocation decisions (col. 9, lines 13-67).

22. As per claim 29, Dave teaches that wherein the cost is defined as a least negative impact on at least one performance factor (col. 9, lines 13-67).

23. As per claim 30, Dave teaches that wherein the at least one performance factor comprises the schedule of tasks (col. 9, lines 13-67).

24. As per claim 31, Dave teaches that wherein the at least one performance factor comprises data movement (col. 9, lines 13-67).

25. As per claim 32, Dave teaches allocating a task having next highest priority to a processor having next least cost according to the demand function (col. 10, lines 35-63).

26. As per claim 33, Dave teaches recalculating the demand function in response to each task in the plurality of tasks being allocated to a processor (col. 6, lines 10-16).

27. As per claim 34, it is rejected for the same reason as claim 1 above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

28. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

29. Claims 10-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dave et al. (hereafter Dave) (U.S. Patent No. 6110220), as applied in claim 1, 34 above, and in view of Ussery et al. (hereafter Ussery) (U.S. Patent No. 6075935).

30. As per claim 10, Dave teaches the invention substantially as claimed in claim 1. Dave did not specifically teach that using a high-level language to describe task-level network behaviors.

31. However, Ussery teaches using a high-level language to describe task-level network behaviors (col. 3, lines 8-17).

32. It would have been obvious to one of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teaching of Dave and Ussery because Ussery teaching of using a high-level language to describe task-level network behaviors would improve Dave's system by providing an environment/method for generating application specific integrated circuits using a fixed but configurable hardware architecture (Ussery, col. 1, lines 10-12).

33. As per claim 11, Dave teaches the invention substantially as claimed in claim 1. Dave did not specifically teach parsing the high-level programming language into an intermediate form.

34. However, Ussery teaches parsing the high-level programming language into an intermediate form (col. 3, lines 18-25).

35. It would have been obvious to one of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teaching of Dave and Ussery because Ussery teaching of parsing the high-level programming language into an intermediate form would improve Dave's system by providing an environment/method for generating application specific integrated circuits using a fixed but configurable hardware architecture (Ussery, col. 1, lines 10-12).

36. As per claim 12, Dave teaches the invention substantially as claimed in claim 1. Dave did not specifically teach generating machine executable code for multiple processor, distributed memory hardware architecture based at least in part on the allocating of the plurality of tasks and data.

37. However, Ussery teaches generating machine executable code for multiple processor, distributed memory hardware architecture based at least in part on the allocating of the plurality of tasks and data (col. 6, lines 31-67).

38. It would have been obvious to one of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teaching of Dave and Ussery because Ussery teaching of generating machine executable code for multiple processor, distributed memory hardware architecture based at least in part on the allocating of the plurality of tasks and data would improve Dave's system by providing an environment/method for generating application specific integrated circuits using a fixed but configurable hardware architecture (Ussery, col. 1, lines 10-12).

39. As per claims 13-14, Dave teaches the invention substantially as claimed in claim 1. Dave did not specifically teach allocating data to private memories/shared memories.

40. However, Ussery teaches allocating data to private memories/shared memories (fig. 5).

41. It would have been obvious to one of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teaching of Dave and Ussery because Ussery teaching of allocating data to private memories/shared memories would improve Dave's system by providing an environment/method for generating application specific integrated circuits using a fixed but configurable hardware architecture (Ussery, col. 1, lines 10-12).

42. As per claims 35-36, they are rejected for the same reason as claim 11 above.

Response to Arguments

43. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-14, and 23-36 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

44. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

45. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jennifer N. To whose telephone number is (571) 272-7212. The examiner can normally be reached on M-T 6AM- 3:30 PM, F 6AM- 2:30 PM.

46. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai An can be reached on (571) 272-3756. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

47. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Jennifer N. To
Examiner
Art Unit 2195


SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
ART UNIT 2195